IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR(CHHATTISGARH)

WRIT PETITION NO. 3591 OF 2003

PETITIONER : Sattoo Lal Sen, son of Shri Sej Lal Sen, aged about 53 years, Occupation-Service, posted at District Ayurved Office, Raigarh as a Head Clerk, resident of Kasher Para, Tehsil and District-Raigarh, (C.G.),.

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS : 1. State of Chhattisgarh, through Secretary, SWASTHYA AND PARIWAR KALYAN VIBHAG, Mantralay, D.K.S.Building, Raipur, District Raipur, (C.G.)

P. R. No. 3396/03
Presented by Shri Aman Kesharwani
dated 31.10.03

: 2. The Director, INDIAN CHIKITSHA PADDATI AND HOMEOPATH, CHHATTISGARH, RAIPUR,

: 3. DISTRICT AYURVED OFFICER, Raigarh, (C.G.)

: 4. State of Chhattisgarh, through Secretary, Finance Department, D.K.S.Building, Mantralay, Raipur, (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA .

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

32

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P. 3591/ सन् 2003

.....विरुद्ध.....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

19.12.2003

Shri Awadh Tripathi, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Sanjay Kumar Agrawal, Deputy Advocate General for the State/ respondents.

Heard both the counsel.

By this writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has challenged orders dated 13.03.2003 (Annexure P-1) and 21.07.2003 (Annexure P-2), by which the petitioner has been transferred from District Ayurved Office, Raigarh, to the Office of Directorate, Homeopath at Raipur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a regular employee in the cadre of Head Clerk, whereas, he has been transferred to the Office of Directorate, Homeopath at Raipur, where no such post exists. He further submits that the petitioner has been illegally transferred at a place where no post of Head Clerk exists. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner made a representation to respondent No.2, but that representation is also not being decided by respondent No.2, therefore, the petitioner may be allowed to make a representation again to respondent No.2 and respondent No.2 be directed to decide the same, for which learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State/respondents has no objection.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation raising all his grievances to respondent No.2 within

[पीछे

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

38

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
Soma	ten days from today and in turn, respondent No.2 shall decide the representation within thirty days from the date of receipt of the same considering all the grievances of the petitioner in an objective manner and with a reasoned order. If the petitioner is continuing at Raigarh, he should be allowed to continue there, till his representation is decided. With the observations and directions, the petition stands disposed of. Consequently, M.(W.)P.No.3247/2003 and I.A.No.10276/2003 also stand disposed of. Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order. **Sd/-** **L.C. Bhadoo** **Judge**	